

all  
aligned with one another in a second horizontal direction, the apertures in each second pair being disposed from and aligned with one another in a second horizontal direction, and wherein each aperture in each first pair is vertically disposed from and aligned with at least one aperture in another first pair, and wherein each aperture in each second pair is vertically disposed from and aligned with at least one aperture in another second pair, wherein each of the apertures in each first pair is horizontally elongated, and wherein each of the apertures in each second pair is vertically elongated.

---

#### **Remarks**

Claims 1-43 are pending in the Application. Claims 2, 4-5, 7, 14-18, 21-22, 26, 28, 30-33, 35-37, and 39 have been amended. Claims 40-56 have been added. No new matter has been added. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

#### **35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, Rejection**

In the Office Action dated August 17, 2000 ("Action"), claims 1-39 were rejected pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

The Action indicates that the claims "are replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors. These errors combined with the sheer volume of the disclosure act to preclude an adequate search

of the prior art.” The Action then provides Action-reproduced claims with inserted codes allegedly indicating insufficient antecedent basis (A), indefiniteness (I), and/or twice entered (T).

The Applicant respectfully disagrees that the claims are indefinite. Also, Applicant does not appreciate the Action’s applied use of incorrect spacing of text in the Action-reproduced claims. The Action’s unauthorized applied change in the original text spacings in the claims appears to be nothing more than an attempt to obfuscate the definiteness of Applicant’s claims.

Applicant takes exception that alleged “grammatical and idiomatic errors” combined with the “shear volume of the disclosure” acted to prevent a search of the prior art. Applicant disagrees that the claims are “replete with grammatical and idiomatic errors.” Furthermore, the size of the disclosure (163 pages of text) is not a basis for a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. The Office at best has alleged a few minor antecedent basis and indefiniteness issues limited to a few claims. However, even if these claims contained the alleged few minor antecedent basis and indefiniteness issues this does not make the claims so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search.

MPEP 702.01 indicates that a reasonable search should be made, except in rare cases where the disclosure is so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search. Furthermore, according to MPEP 702.01, even if the disclosure is so incomprehensible as alleged as to preclude a reasonable search, then Applicant should have been given an opportunity to clarify the disclosure. That is, form paragraph 7.02 should have been used to set a period for reply of one month or thirty days. Applicant has not been given any such opportunity.

Furthermore, MPEP 707.07(g) states that “Piecemeal examination should be avoided as much as possible. The examiner ordinarily should reject each claim on all valid grounds available . . .” An exception is where an application is too informal for a complete action on the merits. However, this is clearly not the situation in the present application. For example, much claim subject matter may be understood in light of specification pages 73-88 and Figures 56-65. This small amount of specification pages for claim basis directly contradicts the Office’s “shear volume” statement.

Furthermore, as indicated in MPEP 2143.02, a claim limitation which is considered indefinite cannot be disregarded. If a claim is subject to more than one interpretation, at least one of which would render the claim unpatentable over the prior art, then the examiner is to reject the claim as indefinite under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph and reject the claim over the prior art. *Ex parte Ionescu*, 222 USPQ 537 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984). In other words, the alleged presence of indefiniteness in a claim, as in the present application, is not a valid reason to avoid conducting a search and/or applying prior art.

Applicant provides herein good and sufficient reasons why the lack of a prior art search was improper. Applicant’s application is in good standing and was entitled to a complete and full search of the prior art in the first Office Action. However, the Action indicates that a search was not conducted. Therefore, Applicant requests that a complete and full search be immediately carried forth by the Office.

Furthermore, the next Action, should it include a prior art-based rejection, cannot be made final because the Office did not carry out a prior search to which Applicant was fully

entitled. If the next Action includes a prior art-based rejection, and is made final, then it will be seen as a premature final rejection. Applicant plans, if necessary, to petition any premature final Action with arguments as to why the Examiner is in clear error.

An example of claims 1 and 29 as being definite is shown below. These claims are reproduced having reference numerals inserted therein. Of course, it should be understood that these reference numerals are for demonstration purposes only and that these claims are not limited to the embodiment presented. No unnecessary limitations are to be implied from using such reference numerals for purposes of demonstrating that the claims are definite and comply with the statutory mandates. All of the claims are to remain broadly construed. Moreover, the elements of the exemplary embodiment referred to are by way of examples and the invention is not limited to the exact details of the embodiments shown or described in the Specification.

#### **Claim 1**

An apparatus comprising:

a supporting structure (550) including a generally vertically extending wall (556), the wall including at least two sets (588; page 75, line 2) of generally horizontally disposed apertures therein, wherein each set (588) of apertures includes a first aperture (562) and a second aperture (564), wherein the first aperture is disposed vertically above the second aperture; and

a releasible connecting member (566), wherein the connecting member in an operative position extends substantially between the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564) and in releasible supporting connection with the wall (556), wherein the releasible connecting member

is adapted for supporting items (e.g., medical items) in operative connection therewith, wherein the releasible connecting member includes two disposed pairs of projecting portions (568, 570) corresponding to the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564), and wherein each pair of projecting portions includes a first projection (570) and a second projection (568), and wherein in the operative position of the connecting member the first projection (570) extends in a first aperture (562) and the second projection (568) extends in a second aperture (564), and wherein in cross section the second projection (568) extends from the connecting member (566) in generally a first direction (Figure 59), and wherein the first projection (570) includes an inner portion (592), wherein the inner portion extends from the connecting member in generally the first direction, and wherein the first projection (570) includes an end portion (596), wherein the end portion extends generally transverse to the first direction and away from the second projection (568), and wherein the connecting member (566) is placed in supporting connection with the wall (556) by extending the end portions (596) of the first projections (570) in the first apertures (562) of the sets (588) and then rotating the connecting member (566) relative to the wall (556) to the operative position wherein the inner portions (592) extend in the first apertures (562) and the second projections (568) extend in the second apertures (564).

#### **Claim 29**

An apparatus comprising:

a pair of drawer guides (574) constructed to support a drawer (620, 628) and allow the drawer to move forward and backward in supporting connection therewith;

a pair of brackets (566) wherein each drawer guide (574) is in operatively fixed connection with a corresponding one of said brackets, wherein each bracket includes a substantially flat elongated member (Figure 56) having a tab portion (568) adjacent each longitudinal end, the tab portions (568) extending in a first direction (Figure 59), wherein the elongated member further includes a finger portion (570) adjacent an upper edge (Figure 56) thereof, wherein the finger portion (570) extends generally transverse to the first direction (Figure 59);

a plurality of walls (Figure 57) defining a cabinet (550), the walls including a top (522), back (558), bottom (554) and a pair of disposed side walls (556, 557), each of the side walls having a plurality of openings (562, 564) therein, the plurality of openings having a predetermined spacing and being configured to receive in releasibly engaging relation the finger portions (570) and the tab portions (568) of the brackets (566), wherein the openings (562, 564) in the side walls (556, 557) are generally horizontally aligned and vertically spaced (Figure 57) wherein the drawer guides (574) are selectively and vertically positionable in the cabinet (550).

### **Claim 1**

The Action objects to the language “the connecting member in an operative position extends substantially between the sets of apertures.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 1, this language may be read “the connecting member (566) in an operative position extends substantially between the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564).” As shown for example in Figures 56 and 57, the connecting member’s projecting portions correspond to wall

apertures. When in an operative position in engagement with a wall, the connecting member substantially extends between the apertures. That is, in an exemplary embodiment, a substantial portion of the connecting member extends between the apertures. It would appear to be impossible for the connecting member to extend completely between the apertures, because in an operative position the connecting member's projecting portions would extend in the corresponding apertures. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

Antecedent basis for "the sets of apertures" in line 6 of filed claim 1 may be found in line 3 and line 4.

The Action also objects to the language "two disposed pairs of projecting portions corresponding to the sets of apertures." The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 1, this language may be read "two disposed pairs of projecting portions (568, 570) corresponding to the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564)." Figures 56 and 57 clearly show that pairs of projecting portions (568, 570) and apertures (562, 564) are associated to achieve a working relationship. Clearly the pairs of projecting portions (568, 570) correspond to the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564). The use of "corresponding" conforms with the English language and well known dictionary definitions in describing the proper relationship of the projecting portions and the apertures. The nature of the correspondence is also understood by one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language "first aperture" and "second aperture" as being twice entered. The Applicant disagrees. This is a misinterpretation of the claim by the Office. The language actually reads "in the operative position of the connecting member the first

projection extends in a first aperture and the second projection extends in a second aperture.” As noted in the referenced claim 1, this language may be read “in the operative position of the connecting member the first projection (570) extends in a first aperture (562) and the second projection (568) extends in a second aperture (564).” The claim had previously provided antecedent basis by stating that “each set (588) of apertures includes a first aperture (562) and a second aperture (564)” and “each pair of projecting portions includes a first projection (570) and a second projection (568).” Therefore, the language is neither twice entered nor indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “extending the end portions of the first projections in the first apertures of the sets and then rotating the connecting member relative to the wall.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 1, this language may be read “extending the end portions (596) of the first projections (570) in the first apertures (562) of the sets (588) and then rotating the connecting member (566) relative to the wall (556).”

Antecedent basis for “the end portions (596)” in line 19 of filed claim 1 may be found based in “each pair of projecting portions includes a first projection (570)” (line 11) and “the first projection (570) includes an end portion (596)” (line 17).

The Action asks “sets of what?” regarding the “the first apertures (562) of the sets (588).” However, it is clear that “the sets” has proper antecedent basis. The previously mentioned “sets” always referred to the sets (588) of apertures (562, 564). For example, note “the sets” (588) of apertures (562, 564) in lines 3, 7, and 10 of filed claim 1. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.



The Action also alleges that “rotating the connecting member (566) relative to the wall (556)” is indefinite. The Action objects to the term “relative.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 1, the full language may be read “the connecting member (566) is placed in supporting connection with the wall (556) by extending the end portions (596) of the first projections (570) in the first apertures (562) of the sets (588) and then rotating the connecting member (566) relative to the wall (556) to the operative position.” That is, “the connecting member (566) is placed in supporting connection with the wall (556) by . . . and then rotating the connecting member (566) relative to the wall (556) to the operative position.” That is, the connecting member or bracket (566) is rotated relative to the wall (556) to place the connecting member (566) in an operative position. Clearly the rotation is relative to the wall. The Specification provides examples of basis by indicating that “As the bracket 566 is rotated, tab projection 568 is moved to extend into an aperture 598 which is part of a set with aperture 594.” (page 76); “The bracket may thereafter be engaged with the side wall by rotating the bracket about the finger portion to extend the tab projections into the cooperating apertures. Once the bracket is in the operative position they are held engaged with the adjacent sidewall.” (pages 76-77); and “This is done in the manner previously described by inserting the finger projections vertically upward into a first aperture in a pair of sets that comprise an arrangement, and then rotating the brackets such that the vertically elongated projections extend in the second apertures in the sets.” (pages 79-80). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “wherein the inner portions extend in the first apertures and the second projections extend in the second apertures.” The Applicant disagrees.

As noted in the referenced claim 1, this language may be read “wherein the inner portions (592) extend in the first apertures (562) and the second projections (568) extend in the second apertures (564).” Antecedent basis for “the inner portions (592)” in line 21 may be found based in lines 11 and 15 of filed claim 1 where “each pair of projecting portions includes a first projection (570)” and “the first projection (570) includes an inner portion (592).” Antecedent basis for “the second apertures (564)” in line 22 may be found based in line 4 of filed claim 1 where “each set (588) of apertures includes a first aperture (562) and a second aperture (564).” Therefore, the language has proper antecedent basis and is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 29**

The Action objects to the language “each drawer guide is in operatively fixed connection with a corresponding one of said brackets.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 29, this language may be read “each drawer guide (574) is in operatively fixed connection with a corresponding one of said brackets (566).” Figures 56 and 59 clearly show a drawer guide (574) associated with a corresponding bracket (566). Clearly a bracket (566) corresponds to a drawer guide (574). The use of “corresponding” conforms with the English language and well known dictionary definitions in describing the proper relationship of a drawer guide and a bracket. The nature of the correspondence is also understood by one having ordinary skill in the art. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “each bracket includes a substantially flat elongated member.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 29, this

language may be read “each bracket (566) includes a substantially flat elongated member.” The term “substantially” precedes the term “flat.” Therefore, “substantially” modifies “flat.” One having ordinary skill in the art would understand “a substantially flat elongated member.” Furthermore, the term “substantially” is held definite by the courts (MPEP 2173.05(b)). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “the walls including a top, back, bottom and a pair of disposed side walls.” The Applicant disagrees. As noted in the referenced claim 29, this language may be read “a plurality of walls (Figure 57) defining a cabinet (550), the walls including a top (522), back (558), bottom (554) and a pair of disposed side walls (556, 557).” That is, the cabinet includes a top (522), back (558), bottom (554) and a pair of disposed side walls (556, 557). The Specification provides an example of basis by indicating that “Cabinet 550 includes a top 552, a bottom 554, side walls 556, 557 and a back wall 558 which define an interior area generally indicated 559.” (page 73). The Action asks “Are these terms describing walls or some other element?” However, the claim clearly recites “the walls including.” It is unclear how the Office could construe “the walls including” as “some other element including.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 4**

The Action objects to the term “relative” in the language “the connecting member is selectively vertically positionable relative to the vertically extending wall.” The Applicant disagrees. Clearly the connecting member (e.g., 566) is positionable relative to the wall (e.g.,

556). One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the term “relative” in the language “the connecting member is selectively vertically positionable relative to the vertically extending wall.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 5**

The Action objects to the term “relative” in the language “the item supporting member is moveable relative to the wall.” The Applicant disagrees. Clearly the item supporting member (e.g., 620, 632) is moveable relative to the wall (e.g., 556). The “wall” has antecedent basis in claim 40, line 2. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the term “relative” in the language “the item supporting member is moveable relative to the wall.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 6**

The Action objects to the term “relative” in the language “the item supporting member is moveable relative to the vertically extending wall.” The Applicant disagrees. Clearly the item supporting member (e.g., 620, 632) is moveable relative to the vertically extending wall (e.g., 556). The “wall” has antecedent basis in claim 40, line 2. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the term “relative” in the language “the item supporting member is moveable relative to the vertically extending wall.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 8**

The Action objects to the term “relative” in the language “the supporting member is generally moveable horizontally relative to the first and second walls.” The Applicant disagrees. Clearly the supporting member (e.g., 620, 632) is moveable relative to the first and second walls (e.g., 556, 557). The “walls” has antecedent basis in claim 7. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the term “relative” in the language. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 9**

The Action objects to the language “a plurality of item supporting members.” The Applicant disagrees. One having ordinary skill in the art would recognize the meaning of “plurality.” Clearly more than one item supporting member (e.g., 620, 632) is being recited. Prior antecedent basis is not necessary. Nevertheless, “an item supporting member” is found in claim 7. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 13**

The Action objects to the language “a first vertical distance” as being twice entered. The Applicant disagrees. The language “a first vertical distance” does not have or need prior antecedent basis. The Action appears to be confusing claim 13 with claim 12. Claim 12 includes the language “a first vertical distance”, but claim 13 is not dependent on claim 12. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 14**

The Action objects to the language “substantially.” As previously discussed, the term “substantially” is held definite by the courts (MPEP 2173.05(b)). Furthermore, “the horizontally elongated first aperture” has antecedent basis in claim 14, lines 1-2. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 15**

The Action objects to the language “at least one second aperture in a set” as being twice entered. The Applicant disagrees. The “set” has prior antecedent basis in the “at least two sets” of claim 40, line 3. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “a direction” as being twice entered. The Applicant disagrees. Claim 40 refers to a “first direction.” Claim 15 recites “a direction generally parallel to the first direction.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “substantially.” As previously discussed, the term “substantially” is held definite by the courts (MPEP 2173.05(b)). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 16**

The Action objects to the language “the first aperture in each of the sets.” The Applicant disagrees. The “sets” have prior antecedent basis in the “at least two sets” of claim 40, line 3.

The “the first aperture” has prior antecedent basis in “each set includes a first aperture and a second aperture” of claim 40, line 5. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “the first projections.” The Applicant disagrees. The “the first projections” have antecedent basis. Claim 40, at line 15, recites “each pair of projecting portions includes a first projection.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “substantially.” As previously discussed, the term “substantially” is held definite by the courts (MPEP 2173.05(b)). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 20**

The Action objects to the language “removing from the apparatus” as a negative recitation of elements. The Applicant disagrees. Claim 20 is a method claim based on the apparatus of claim 19. Claim 19 recites “a plurality of item supporting members.” Claim 20 recites “removing from the apparatus recited in claim 19 at least one item supporting member.” Clearly an item supporting member (such as a drawer (e.g., 620, 632)) has to be present before it can be removed. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand “removing from the apparatus recited in claim 19 at least one item supporting member.” Nevertheless, “negative limitations” are held definite by the courts (MPEP 2173.05(i)). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 21**

The Action objects to the language “removing from the apparatus” as a negative recitation of elements. The Applicant disagrees. The Applicant’s arguments concerning the alleged negative recitation of elements are herein incorporated from the arguments regarding claim 20.

Also, step a) recites “removing . . . at least one item supporting member.” Thus, “the removed item supporting member” in step b) refers to the item supporting member removed in step a). Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 22**

The Action objects to the language “an item supporting member.” The Applicant disagrees. Claim 19, from which claim 22 depends, recites “a plurality of item supporting members.” Thus, the language “an item supporting member” has antecedent basis in claim 19. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 24**

The Action objects to the language “removing from the apparatus” as a negative recitation of elements. The Applicant disagrees. The Applicant’s arguments concerning the alleged negative recitation of elements are herein incorporated from the arguments regarding claim 20.



The Action also objects to the language “a plurality of item supporting members.” The Applicant disagrees. Claim 19, from which claim 24 depends, recites “a plurality of item supporting members.” In step a) of claim 24 the plurality of item supporting members are removed. In step d) of claim 24 a plurality of item supporting members are installed. One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the recited steps of removing and installing. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 27**

The Action objects to the language “at least one of the item supporting members removed in step (a)” as a negative recitation of elements. The Applicant disagrees. The Applicant’s arguments concerning the alleged negative recitation of elements are herein incorporated from the arguments regarding claim 20. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

#### **Claim 30**

The Action objects to the language “a finger portion.” The Applicant disagrees. Claim 41, from which claim 30 depends, recites “each bracket includes a substantially flat elongated member” and each “elongated member further includes finger portions.” Thus, antecedent basis is provided for the language “a finger portion.” One having ordinary skill in the art would understand the language “a finger portion.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 34**

The Action objects to the language “one row of vertically spaced openings.” The Action asks “which of the earlier entered rows is this referring to?” The Applicant disagrees. The claim 34 language actually reads “the second series of openings includes in each side wall, one row of vertically spaced openings.” The language “one row of vertically spaced openings” does not have or need prior antecedent basis. The Action appears to be confusing claim 34 with claim 31. Claim 31 includes the language “one row of vertically spaced openings”, but claim 34 is not dependent on claim 31. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 35**

The Action objects to the language “each of the openings in the second series of openings.” The Action indicates confusion. The Applicant disagrees. Claim 33 recites that “the plurality of openings further comprises a second series of openings in each side wall, wherein each of the openings in the second series are vertically spaced on each side wall.” The specification provides clear examples of first and second series of openings (e.g., 562, 564). For example, note Specification page 74. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 36**

The Action objects to the language “the cabinet includes as least one outer wall” as lacking antecedent basis. The Applicant disagrees. The language “the cabinet includes at least one outer wall” does not have or need prior antecedent basis. Furthermore, claim 41 recites “a

cabinet”. The specification provides clear examples of the cabinet including as least one outer wall (e.g., 582, 584). For example, note Specification pages 73-74. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 38**

The Action objects to the language “the door” as lacking antecedent basis. The Applicant disagrees. For example, “a door” is clearly found in claim 37 from which claim 38 depends. Thus, antecedent basis is provided for the language “the door.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

### **Claim 39**

The Action objects to the language “the lock module” as lacking antecedent basis. The Applicant disagrees. For example, “a lock module” is clearly found in claim 38 from which claim 39 depends. Thus, antecedent basis is provided for the language “the lock module.” Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

The Action also objects to the language “authorized inputs” as lacking antecedent basis. The Applicant disagrees. The claim 39 language actually reads “the data store includes data representative of a storage location within the cabinet, the first medical item stored in the storage location in the cabinet, and authorized inputs for enabling access to the first medical item.” The language “authorized inputs” does not have or need prior antecedent basis. Therefore, the language is not indefinite.

**Claims 1-39 Meet The Requirements Of 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph**

As shown, claims 1-39 are not indefinite. Furthermore, as also shown, the claims were not so incomprehensible as to preclude a reasonable search. Applicant respectfully submits that the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejections should be withdrawn. Applicant further respectfully submits that all of the claims should be indicated allowable.

**New Claims Submitted Herewith  
Are Also Patentably Distinguishable**

New claims 40-56 have been submitted herewith. Each of these claims recite features of exemplary embodiments of the present invention. It is respectfully that the new claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, and patentably distinguish over the prior art.

As previously discussed, it should be understood that any reference numerals are for discussion purposes only and that these claims are not limited to the embodiment presented. No unnecessary limitations are to be implied from using such referenced claim language for discussion purposes. All of the claims are to remain broadly construed. Moreover, the descriptions given are by way of examples and the invention is not limited to the exact details of the examples shown or described.

Claim 40 is similar to claim 1. Claim 41 is similar to claim 29. Claims 42 and 43 have basis in the Specification and Figures 56 and 59.

Claim 44 recites an apparatus comprising a cabinet with side walls. The cabinet is adapted for housing medical items. Each side wall includes a plurality of first pairs of apertures

and a plurality of second pairs of apertures. For example, a first pair (e.g., 562, 562) and a second pair (e.g., 564, 564) are shown in Figure 57.

As recited in claim 45, each of the first pair apertures (e.g., 562, 562) may be horizontally elongated.

As recited in claim 46, each of the second pair apertures (e.g., 564, 564) may be vertically elongated.

Claim 53 recites an apparatus comprising a cabinet with side walls. The cabinet is adapted for housing medical items. One of either apertures and projections is associated with the side walls, and the other of either the apertures and projections is associated with the medical item supporting structures. For example, note Figures 56, 57, and 59.

Claim 56 recites a set having a first pair of apertures and a second pair of apertures. For example, a first pair (e.g., 562, 562) and a second pair (e.g., 564, 564) are shown in Figure 57. Each first pair aperture (e.g., 562) may be horizontally elongated. Each second pair aperture (e.g., 564) may be vertically elongated.

#### **Fees For Additional Claims**

Please charge the fees associated with the submission of four additional independent claims and seventeen claims in excess of twenty claims (\$626) and any other fee due to deposit account 04-1077.

### Conclusion

Each of Applicant's claims meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Furthermore, each of Applicant's pending claims specifically recite features and relationships that are neither disclosed nor suggested in any applied art. Allowance of all of Applicant's pending claims is therefore respectfully requested.

The undersigned will be happy to discuss any aspect of the Application by telephone at the Examiner's convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Ralph E. Jocke      Reg. No. 31,029  
WALKER & JOCKE  
231 South Broadway  
Medina, Ohio 44256  
(330) 721-0000